DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 748 EA 007 336

AUTHOR Bank, Adrianne
TITLE The Planning of Practice: Who Does What To Whom?
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Autoinstructional Aids; *Autoinstructional Programs; Decision Making; Elementary Education; Guides; Models; *Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; *Program Planning

ABSTRACT

Because there appears to be a need for the facilitation of planning in elementary schools, the Center for the Study of Evaluation has established programs to provide for people in schools the knowledge and skills they need to do local program planning and evaluation. One of these programs is the self-instructional, self-contained Program Planning Kit. The kit does not contain program or evaluation plans, rather it provides step-by-step procedures for school staffs to use when planning educational programs and their evaluation. The kit contains materials for people filling the roles of planning coordinator, planning team member, and evaluation planner. Two major sources of difficulty in using the kit arose during its field testing: one was concerned with the field test situation; one had to do with the difficulties of doing program planning in the schools as they are currently organized. The former problem is readily solved, the latter is not. Only by rethinking how teachers' and principals' time can be most profitably spent and by making planning time available to them can the idea of program planning on the local level be given an adequate trial. (Author/IRT)

THE PLANNING OF PRACTICE:

WHO DOES WHAT TO WHOM?

Adrianne Bank

Annual Convention of the
American Educational Research Association
Washington, D.C.
April, 1975

THE PLANNING OF PRACTICE:

WHO DOES WHAT TO WHOM?*

Introduction

Program planning at the local school level seems like a good idea, and as the saying goes, like a good idea whose time has come. In this paper I shall describe what happened when we, at the Center for the Study of Evaluation, tried to facilitate the planning of practice in elementary schools by supplying principals and teachers with written materials in the form of a Program Planning Kit.

Before doing this, however, let me list a few of the many reasons why local level planning seems to me to be a good idea. First, planning at the school level, by involving those people who will actually do the teaching, can result in educational program plans which are both realistic and teachable. Such plans would take into account the capabilities and willingness of the adults responsible for the program as well as the unique characteristics of the students and their community. Secondly, planning at the school level can encourage the professional growth of school faculties. Instead of accepting a curriculum or a program devised elsewhere, school staffs would be able to explore alternative programs. They would discuss, try out, and finally select those most appropriate to their previously identified needs. Or, if a satisfactory program could not be located, school staffs would be able to develop their own program objectives and program activities. The discussions attendant

---

*A paper presented for the symposium "School Level Program Planning: Is That Where It's At?" Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D C., April, 1975.

upon such decision making would expand the professional expertise of teachers by giving them practice stating objectives, developing relevant activities, defining evaluation procedures, and anticipating continuous recycling for program improvement. A third benefit of local program planning is in the probable increase in morale within the school. Since program planning is, of necessity, a cooperative effort involving teachers, parents, and principals, it should result in increased communication between teachers and greater coordination among classrooms. Instead of feeling individually accountable for the learning of students--some of whom may have arrived in their classrooms unprepared by other teachers--teachers would collectively assume responsibility for the learning of students as they progressed through elementary school.

At the present time, it seems that the concept of local program planning has been stimulated by various trends within the field of education. For example, the move towards decentralizing large school districts leaves more decision making authority in the hands of the building principal. The emphasis on accountability reminds the principal of the need to justify programs in terms of pupil progress. The requirement on the part of federal and state funding agencies for the submission of building-level plans for programs and for their evaluations would seem to encourage the development of a local planning process. A specific case is the Early Childhood Education program in California which requires that teachers and parents be involved in the planning of and evaluation of program components such as language, math, health and auxiliary services, staff development, and parent education.

Appropriate roles related to local program planning

It would seem that the role of various levels of government has been to create, if not the necessity, at least the impetus, for the development of local program planning efforts. The stage has thus been set, and the actors are in each local school.

What role then does a research and development organization such as the Center for the Study of Evaluation play? The Center, established in 1966 at UCLA, has as its stated mission to increase the number of people who can meet their own planning and evaluation needs. Thus, the Center sees its role as providing people in schools with the knowledge and skills needed to do local program planning and evaluation. In fulfillment of its mission, the Center has developed test review Manuals as a resource for educators, a series of evaluation Workshops as training sessions for educators, as well as a series of evaluation Kits. The Kits are self-instructional and self-contained. They provide step-by-step procedures for school staffs to use when planning educational programs and their evaluations. A kit dealing with program planning is the second in the series. Preceding it is a Needs Assessment Kit which deals with assembling community and teacher preferences, then obtaining baseline data on highly preferred goals, and finally deciding how to allocate resources. Following the Program Planning Kit are two additional kits. One deals with formative evaluation procedures for monitoring the operation of a program and the progress of students so that program improvements can be made. The other, the Summative Evaluation Kit suggests ways of designing and carrying out an evaluation so that a given program can be compared with others in order that certification decisions can be made. The Program Planning Kit which we will

be discussing in the remainder of this paper contains guidelines and resource materials for planning programs and planning evaluations. Its audience is teachers, parents, and principals at an elementary school.

Our role as CSE staff members responsible for developing the Kit, was to provide planning and evaluation information for people in schools so that they could organize themselves to make the decisions needed to formulate a comprehensive plan for an educational program. The Kit does not contain program or evaluation plans, but rather contains guidelines so that people can create their own plans.*

Program planning at the local school level seemed to us a sufficiently complex enterprise to require a differentiation of roles. The Kit contains materials for people filling each of the roles of planning coordinator, planning team member, and evaluation planner.

The planning coordinator, a role likely to be filled by either the principal or an agent designated by the principal, is to be in charge of the planning effort. The coordinator's job begins after a decision has been made to plan a program to meet an existing educational need. The coordinator initiates the planning effort by persuading teachers and parents of the desirability of planning at the school and by setting up both the psychological and physical conditions essential to planning. The coordinator selects the planning team and helps it get started. He or she also selects the person who will fill the role of evaluation planner. Thus, the coordinator's role is part administrative, part facilitative, and part public relations for the program, tasks not unlike those usually performed in the course of a principal's day.

*Definitions of terms as they are used in the CSE Kit are in Appendix A.

The planning team, composed of teachers--and possibly parents--does the actual work of instructional decision making. It is the team members who, with the guidance and resources provided in the Kit, develop a plan which clearly spells out the rationale for the program, the administrative characteristics of the program (students, staffing, scheduling, space, etc.), the objectives, activities, and instructional materials for the program. Planning team members also work with the evaluation planner to formulate the questions they would like an evaluation of the program to answer, and to recommend the kinds of data that they would find useful and credible for making decisions connected with the program. The planning team does most of its work during meetings, although some tasks can be accomplished by individuals between meetings. The planning team's role requires that teachers engage in longer range planning than they are at present accustomed to doing, and that they do so collectively rather than individually. The role of planning team members may require of teachers new behavior, or new combinations of behaviors, than they are presently accustomed to.

The evaluation planner is a role which does not currently exist in most schools. Unlike the coordinator who in another capacity has probably performed most of the tasks connected with initiating and facilitating a collaborative teacher effort, and unlike the planning team who--at least as individuals--have already had some experience in instructional decision making, the evaluation planner has a task likely to be totally new to him or her. The person who is the evaluation planner is, according to the CSE Kit, supposed to act as an advocate for evaluation, a conceptualizer for the evaluation, and a place holder for the evaluation. This simply means that he or she tries to convince

the planning team to regard evaluation planning as an important activity that should occur along with program planning. He or she tries to help the planning team members think about the kind of evaluation they would like, the evaluation questions they regard as important, and the methods they would accept for gathering information to answer the questions. He or she tries to reserve time and space within the program--at its beginning, during its operation and at the end--for the administration of tests or other measures to assess program operation and pupil progress. This is not likely to be an easy job for the evaluation planner, especially since the person filling this role probably does not have technical skills in the areas of research design, test selection or construction, or statistical analysis. But this role must be brought into existence at the building level, it seems to us, in order for evaluations to be planned at the appropriate time (that is, when the program itself is being planned) and by the appropriate people (that is, by the people who plan the program). Given the unavailability of professional evaluators who can come in to work on a continuing basis with school staffs, it seems logical to train school people as para-professional evaluators.

I have just described some of the roles which we thought of as being essential to program planning at the local school level: the direction-setting role of the government agencies supplying the impetus to do such planning; the information-supplying role of the CSE Kit developers; and the roles within the school of coordinator, planning team, and evaluation planner. Next, I shall briefly describe how these roles were or, in some cases, were not carried out during the national field test of the Kit.

The actuality of local program planning

Our role. As developers of the Kit, we were of course eager to find out how our materials were used and how to improve them. For our formative evaluation, we sent questionnaires and checklists to all planning coordinators, to all planning teams, and to all evaluation planners. We wanted information about who did what with whom, in the planning of practice.

Before proceding, I want to note that we had great attrition during the course of the field test. We started with 36 schools. Thirteen schools (31 teams) were still persevering in program planning by the end of the field test We did not even receive complete sets of data from all of those schools. After describing what happened in these schools, I will discuss some of the reason that principals gave us for dropping out of the field test because the reasons indicate that our role complicated the local program planning effort.

Who was the coordinator and what did he or she do? The role of coordinator was, as anticipated, filled by the principal of the school in most cases. (In four schools it was not clear whether a teacher or the principal assumed that role.) The twelve coordinators who returned our checklist had completed the tasks relating to orienting themselves to their own responsibilities and to initiating the planning effort by appointing a team and an evaluation planner. They did not carry out their responsibilities for drafting the management sections of the final program plan, and they did not begin the process of institutionalizing the program planning process. A description of the tasks and the number of people completing them appears in Figure 1.

What did the planning teams do? Although most of the schools organized a single planning team, one school worked with four planning teams and another

Figure 1
Coordinator Tasks
(as indicated in Coordinator Guidebook)

	(N = 12) # Completing task
Introduction and Overview	
1. read "Introduction" in Coordinator's Guidebook	11
2. read "Outline of Program Plan" in Coordinator's Guidebook	11
3. read "What Coordinator Does" in Coordinator's Guidebook	12
Initiating the Planning Effort	
4. assess climate of school for program planning	10
5. gain support of faculty, district, and community for program planning	10
6. choose planning team	11
7. help planning team decide on goal, administrative characteristics of program, and planning strategy	10
8. choose evaluation planner	9
Facilitating the Work of the Planning Team and the Evaluation Planner	
9. help planning team schedule meetings, select recorder, and team leader(s)	11
10. establish procedures for keeping informed of work of planning team and evaluation planner	9
Develop Management Systems for both Program and Evaluation	
11. develop task-time line for both program and evaluation	8
12. develop budget for both program and evaluation	5
Writing the Program Plan	
13. receive instructional plan from planning team	10
14. receive evaluation plan from evaluation planner	7
15. write management plan	3
16. write program plan	3
17. review program plan for consistency, comprehensiveness, and feasibility	4
18. revise program plan	2
After the Program is Planned	
19. recognize accomplishments of the planning team and evaluation planner	6
20. publicize the program plan	1
21. begin implementation of the program and of the evaluation	1
22. begin next program planning effort	1

had six. Leadership of the team was usually assumed by one of the teachers. All teams used a single leader instead of the rotating leadership system which was an alternate suggestion made in the Kit.

Each planning team selected one of the three planning strategies offered in the Kit. Nineteen teams followed our objectives-based strategy in which they analyzed their goal first into program objectives and then into more specific instructional objectives, for which they finally developed learning activities. Eighteen teams used a teaching models strategy in which they first selected a teaching model incorporating a philosophy of education or a psychology of teaching with which they agreed. They then planned objectives and activities based on the teaching model. Six teams followed the materials-based strategy in which they first identified their requirements for a program, then selected a program from among commercially available materials. They then based their own objectives and activities upon those materials.

In general, planning teams using the objectives-based strategy were most successful in working through the tasks and arriving at a program plan. Teams using the teaching models did, in fact, select a teaching model but most did not proceed through to planning a program using the model. Teams using the materials-based strategy had difficulties completing their program plan within the field test time line because of the delay in obtaining sample materials requested from the publishers. A description of the tasks for each of the planning strategies and the number of teams completing them appear in Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Figure 2
Planning Team Tasks
for the Objectives-Based Planning Strategy

	(N =) teams # completing task
Getting Organized	
1. learn terms that describe components of a program plan	8
2. discuss components of program plan	
Deciding on Program Objectives	
3. analyze goal statement	7
4. utilize resources for generation/selection of program objectives	7
5. write program objectives	8
6. critique program objectives	6
7. consider evaluation issues related to program objectives	
Deciding on Behavioral Objectives	
8. utilize resources for generation/selection of behavioral objectives	7
9. write behavioral objectives	6
10. critique behavioral objectives	7
11. discuss how to assess behavioral objectives	5
Deciding on Activities	
12. brainstorm ideas for learning activities	4
13. write prototypical activity cards as a group	4
14. write activity cards individually	6
15. devise method for updating activity cards	3
16. consider evaluation questions related to learning activities	4
Planning a Program Schedule	
17. order behavioral objectives	5
18. schedule pre-assessment of pupil behavior	6
19. schedule learning activities	6
20. schedule progress checks	6
21. approve completed program plan	4

Figure 3
Planning Team Tasks
for the Teaching Models Planning Strategy

	(N = 10 teams) # completing task
Getting Organized	
1. read about teaching models, program plans, evaluation plans	10
2. discuss what will be done in planning your program and its evaluation	7
Deciding on Teaching Models	
3. read about teaching models and their use in planning	10
4. eliminate models inappropriate for your situation	9
5. rate and rank all models remaining	3
Learning About the Models	
6. use study guides*	
7. read and discuss point of view of model(s)	4
8. read and discuss anticipated outcomes of model(s)	4
9. read and discuss characteristics of model(s) activities	2
10. read and discuss organization and scheduling characteristics of the model(s)	2
Designing Model-Based Instruction	
11. write program rationale	4
12. consider the kind of evaluation you want	4
13. outline subject matter topics	3
14. write program objectives	3
15. critique program objectives	4
16. discuss important program objectives and assessment of pupil achievement	3
17. write and critique prototypical activities	3
18. use activity card format	2
19. determine method for developing activity cards	1
20. decide how to monitor program activities	1
21. schedule program activities	3
22. decide how to pre-assess pupils and monitor progress	

*For task 6, teams reported specific study guide(s) they used. The frequency of use of each of the six study guides available was as follows: Group Inquiry (2); Role Playing (2); Non-Directive (1); Behavior Modification (2); Experiential Learning (2); and Creative Thinking (3).

Figure 4
Planning Team Tasks
for the Materials-Based Planning Strategy

	(N = 2 teams) # completing task
Getting Organized	
1. read "What is in the KIT" and the "Overview"	2
2. discuss what will be done in planning your program	1
Finding Programs	
3. discuss requirements essential for your program	0
4. determine what programs are available	2
5. obtain a copy of potential programs	0
6. review programs	0
7. fill out program description cards for each program	0
Examining Programs	
8. collect information from program users	0
9. read "Categories for Analyzing Programs" and eliminate categories unimportant to you	0
10. analyze and describe programs on Program Analysis Chart	0
11. select programs for tryout	0
Trying Out Programs	
12. determine what to find out from the tryout	0
13. select participants to be involved in the tryout	0
14. decide how to conduct tryouts	0
15. analyze and interpret tryout results	0
Selecting and Adapting a Program	
16. select a program	0
17. select or develop program objectives	1
18. determine which objectives needed to be evaluated	1
19. select or develop behavioral objectives	1
20. determine how to assess pupil progress	1
21. select or develop learning activities	0
22. determine how to monitor learning activities	1
23. adapt or develop a program	0
24. schedule pre-assessment and progress checks	

Who was the evaluation planner and what did he or she do? The evaluation planner role in most schools was left unfilled. Of the eight individuals who identified themselves as fulfilling this role, two were teachers, three were principals, and the remainder were within school administrative staff or assorted district personnel. Generally, evaluation planners were able to assist the planning team in deciding whether they wanted a formative or a summative evaluation, but beyond that, other tasks connected with evaluation were more difficult to complete. Each task for the evaluation planner and the number of people completing it are presented in Figure 5.

Sources of difficulty in local program planning. Unfortunately, instead of being able to report the success of the program planning effort at the elementary schools participating in the field test of the Program Planning Kit, we must instead indicate that there were difficulties in sustaining such an effort, most dramatically illustrated by the high drop out from the field test. There are those who would say, "I told you so. Curriculum development should be in the hands of subject matter experts or full time curriculum planners. School people cannot do this." There are others who would say, "I told you so. Products such as the Kit, no matter how comprehensive or well designed, cannot be all things to all people. Instruction in how to develop programs must have live people--technical experts--to help school staffs learn how to plan." And then there is a third group of people--of who I am one--who would say, "What is there that didn't work out in the program planning effort? What made it difficult for people to use the CSE materials? What roles were left unfilled?"

Teacher questionnaire responses and telephone interviews with principals indicate that there were two major sources of difficulty in planning using the

Figure 5
Evaluation Planner tasks
(as indicated in Evaluator's Guidebook)

To help planning team make recommendations concerning	(N = 11) # completing task
1. whether formative and/or summative evaluation should be conducted	9
2. when the evaluation should begin/end	9
3. program objectives for which evaluation information will be needed	6
4. instruments for assessing end-of-program student achievement	6
5. program activities for which evaluation information will be needed	7
6. instruments for monitoring program activities	5
7. if pre-assessment of students is needed	6
8. instruments for pre-assessment	4
9. if student progress checks are needed	7
10. instruments for student progress checks	4
11. what the program evaluator's job will be	5

CSE Program Planning Kit. One concerned our role in the field test situation. The other concerned the difficulties of doing program planning within the context of schools as currently organized.

There were difficulties caused by the field test itself. First, some of the materials were mailed late so that school staffs had to organize themselves for planning in advance of receiving the planning team materials. Additionally, the field test time line was dictated by our deadlines rather than by the needs of the schools. Our data collection procedures required questionnaires and interview responses in addition to the record-keeping needed for program planning. This overwhelmed people in some schools. And finally, the Kit materials themselves were in field test form--cumbersome, wordy, not always conveniently packaged and formated. These problems we see as relatively simple ones which can be corrected in the published version of the Kit.

However, there was another set of problems connected with program planning more difficult to overcome. They involve the motivation needed to do program planning, the level of skill needed to do program planning, and support and rewards available for doing program planning.

We were mistaken in thinking that there was a widespread felt need to do local program planning. The schools who volunteered for our field test did initially perceive their own need for program planning or they would not have responded to our request for participation. That so many dropped out when they discovered the time commitment necessitated by local level program planning is evidence that their need was not urgent especially when compared with the pressures of more immediate problems requiring teacher and administrator time. Especially in situations where there was no local parental or district

pressure for new or improved programs, or where there was not the promise of immediate funds for a successful locally generated proposal, planning seemed to be relegated to a back burner.

We found, also, that the level of skill required for a planning team to work productively together to make instructional decisions was higher than could be supplied by the CSE Kit alone. The Kit is not intended to provide training as such. It does not supply instruction in advance of application. For example, teachers do not practice writing or critiquing objectives before they write or critique them for their own program. They learn whatever they need to know about program planning at the same time as they plan their own program. They learn about evaluation when they have to plan their own program evaluation. This makes the first round of program planning a difficult one. Most planning teams were enthusiastic when they began. Unless they had had previous experience or strong leadership, however, they were not able to sustain their momentum over the amount of time needed to complete a program plan.

This last point is crucial. The support system for local planning did not exist in most schools. There seemed to be no time when teachers could meet together on a sustained basis. In six schools released time was provided to teachers by arranging for substitutes. But principals reported that teachers felt anxious about the progress of their classes and disliked the extra work of writing lesson plans for substitutes. In four schools, release time was provided by early dismissal days. In one school, an "open-pod" organization made possible a schedule which gave teachers planning time on a regular basis. In another, a two day retreat (financed by teachers) was planned. One team met in teachers' homes in the evening.

Program planning was clearly regarded by most school staffs as an extra duty to be undertaken by dedicated teachers if they could snatch the time rather than as an integral part of normal teaching responsibilities for which part of the work week was reserved. Within the field test, there were inventive and enthusiastic principals who managed to facilitate the planning efforts of teachers. However, they were the exception rather than the rule and worked against tremendous difficulties.

What we learned about school-level program planning

We have become somewhat less optimistic about the possibility of program planning on the local school level if all the actors--both inside and outside the local school--continue to play their present roles.

It became clear to us that our role of simply providing principals and teachers with self-instructional materials which give them guidelines for performing a complicated task is not sufficient. Other forms of technical assistance are required unless teachers and principals have somewhere acquired previous experience. For example, the Center produces workshops, in addition to kits, to train individuals in specific planning and evaluation skills. Such workshops could be integrated with kits to provide additional training to schools interested in doing their own planning and evaluation. Support in the form of mutual trouble-shooting, sharing of plans, exchanges of school personnel experienced in planning and evaluation could be accomplished by linking schools interested in doing local planning with one another.

Within the schools, developing the capability for doing local planning and evaluation could be seen as part of a systematic staff development or in-service training program. Rather than forcing innovative school staffs to

bootleg time and money for local planning, such activities could be institutionalized by regularly providing staff time for planning. Only by rethinking how teachers' and principals' time can be most profitably spent and by making such time available to them can the idea of program planning on the local level be given an adequate trial.

APPENDIX A:

Definitions

Program. A program, as we use it here, is a coordinated and comprehensive set of activities and materials intended to help pupils achieve knowledge, skill, and/or attitude objectives. A program may be of several weeks duration or it may last the entire school year. It may affect only a few pupils or the entire school. Many teachers may be involved in teaching the program or only one.

Program plan. A program plan, as we use the term in this Kit, is a written document drafted by the coordinator based on his/her own work, as well as the work of the planning team and the evaluation planner. It includes a description of the instructional, management, and evaluation components for an educational program.

Program planning. Program planning is a decision making process. Decisions are made, in a step-by-step manner, to take into account all of the elements which must be considered in order to develop a workable and successful program. Obviously, there is no single correct way to plan a program, nor a single order in which to make decisions. The Kit provides three alternative decision sequences for deciding on all aspects of instruction, i.e., objectives, activities, materials, setting. Program Planning, as outlined in the Kit, is also a group process. Since planning in an elementary school is a complex task requiring many skills and much time, it seemed well to divide up all responsibilities among a number of people. Since the instructional component of the program is so central, a team effort for planning it seemed appropriate. Therefore, this Kit encourages the formation of a planning team made up of both teachers and parents who can combine their knowledge of children, of teaching, of subject matter, and of resources to create an educational program.

Evaluation. As used in this Kit, evaluation refers to the process of determining the kinds of decisions that have to be made: selecting, collecting, and analyzing information used in making these decisions; and then reporting this information to teachers and others who may be involved in making decisions about the program. The evaluation to be planned here is an evaluation of the operation and effectiveness of the program itself, and not of the teachers involved in it. That is, evaluation information is to be collected for the purpose of improving the functioning of the program rather than for judging teacher performance or for assigning marks to pupils.

Evaluation planning. Evaluation planning involves considering the purposes and procedures of an anticipated evaluation so that information concerning pupil progress and program activities can be collected at the appropriate time with the appropriate instruments. The process of planning an evaluation, as used in the Kit, is not a technical one, but rather an intellectual one which we believe should include the active involvement of those people who have responsibilities for the planning and conduct of the program itself.